

**PANTEX PLANT CITIZENS' ADVISORY BOARD***806/372-3311 (phone) 806/372-3999 (fax)***DRAFT MEETING SUMMARY****TWENTIETH MEETING****Tuesday, January 23, 1996****1:30 p.m. - 5:55 p.m.****Amarillo Association of Realtors  
Amarillo, Texas****INTRODUCTION**

The twentieth meeting of the Pantex Plant Citizens' Advisory Board (PPCAB) was held on Tuesday, January 23, 1996 at the Amarillo Association of Realtors, Amarillo, Texas. The meeting began at 1:30 p.m. and adjourned at 5:55 p.m. The agenda included the following:

- \* Task Force reports including, Environmental Restoration and Sitewide EIS
- \* Updates from the Department of Energy (DOE), including occurrence reports
- \* Subcommittee reports including Nominations

**PPCAB Members in Attendance** John Blakley, Jr., Ronald Zerm, Patrick Padilla, Louise Daniel, Denise Price, Guyon Saunders, Doris Berg Smith, Mavis Belisle, Willie Beverly, Pam Allison, C E Williams, Jere White, and Beverly Gattis

**PPCAB Members not in Attendance** Sam Arkafie, Belinda Taylor, Jeffery B. Keith, and Tonya Kleuskens

**Ex-Officio Members in Attendance** Tom Williams, DOE, Gerald Johnson, DOE, Roger Mulder, Office of the Governor, Joe Martillotti, Texas Department of Health, Bureau of Radiation Control, Joe Panketh, TNRCC

**Ex-Officio Members not in Attendance** Boyd Deaver, Texas Natural Resources Conservation Commission (TNRCC), Judith Black, Environmental Protection Agency, Sam Goodhope, Office of the Attorney General

**Resource People in Attendance** Bruce Campbell, Mason & Hanger, Stacy A. Mansoor, PPCAB Administrator

**Meeting Facilitator** Marilyn Van Petten, Van Petten Resource Development





**Observers** John Bernier, Herbert S Berman, P J Boschetti, Marvin Johnson, James Hallihan, Eva M Auman, Hollace Weiner, Sue King, Jim McConnell, Melanie Loewenstern, Paula Breeding, Bill Weinreich, Richard Edmonson, Gary Baker, Kerry Campbell-Keith, Vanessa Tatum, Bob Juba, Tom Carpenter, Robert C Seldon, Joe Wyatt, Marcia Keegan, Dave Heim, Dick Watkins, Robin McLaurin, Jacqueline Godwin, Paul Sowa, Brenda Britten, John Bell, Carlton F Clements, and Bob Barton

## **ATTACHMENTS**

Attachments distributed to Board members and guests during the meeting are not included here. Copies will be sent to Board members who were absent. Others may obtain attachments by contacting Stacy A Mansoor, Office Administrator, at 806/372-3311 or by visiting a DOE Reading Room.

### **Mailed before the Meeting to the PPCAB**

Draft Meeting Summary for November 28, 1995 meeting, Draft Agenda for January 23 meeting, DOE Occurrence Report, Facilitator Memo, Task Force and Subcommittee Minutes, Nomination Subcommittee Minutes/Memo

### **Enclosed with these Meeting Notes for PPCAB Members and Ex-Officios**

Draft Agenda for February 27, 1996 meeting, Occurrence Report, Meeting Notice, Subcommittee and Task Force Minutes

### **Distributed to PPCAB at Meeting and Sent to Absentees**

Update from ATSDR  
Budget and Finance Subcommittee Minutes  
Corrected front page from November minutes

## **OPENING COMMENTS**

Van Petten welcomed everyone and reviewed the agenda. The Board approved the November meeting summary, with one change as filed. This change was noted at the meeting and included in the November official minutes.

## **REPORT FROM CO-CHAIRS**

Louise Daniel reported that in November she, Ron Zerm, and Bruce Campbell had attended a waste management conference for SSABs in Denver. The conference was about common issues among sites. Some Advisory Boards want to set up a mechanism for continuing to discuss these crosscutting issues which remain unresolved. She will update the Board as issues are discussed and resolved.

Daniel directed the Board to the Subcommittee/Task Force preference form and ask that all complete the form and return to Stacy Mansoor at the close of the meeting.



Daniel addressed the need to update the PPCAB Groundrules issue and asked the Policy and Personnel Subcommittee to consider this at their next meeting

Orientation for all new Board members as well as all other Board members will be held prior to the February Board meeting **Daniel reiterated that all Board member should notify Mansoor of their attendance prior to the scheduled Board meetings** She informed the group that she has been contacted by two organizations soliciting participation/representatives from the PPCAB to serve on their respective committees The first is Urban Energy and Transportation Corporation, an organization working with DOE Most members on this board have technical expertise, Daniel added that this group will pay all expenses incurred for a representative The second organization, Energy Communities Alliance, is also interested in a PPCAB member serving on their committee The expenses for that member must be paid by the PPCAB Daniel urged any interested members to contact her and she will provide additional information

Daniel stated that she gave a talk on the PPCAB to the Rotary Club as an individual rather than as co-chair or representative of the Board

Guyon Saunders asked the group to consider selecting a Board member to serve as co-chair to assist Daniel in her duties as co-chair Saunders said his group would propose a member to serve as co-chair in February

### **Pantex Fatality Report**

Paul Sowa, Division Manager, Safeguards and Security, Mason & Hanger, reported on the recent death of (b) (6) Security Police Officer (SPO) Martinez had been a Mason & Hanger employee for 11 years and was an SPO II He contacted a trainer on December 16, 1995 to arrange to take a physical fitness qualification test (b) (6) collapsed 40 yards from the finish line as he was completing the test The trainer massaged his chest while waiting for the Fire Department, contacted by a subcontractor who saw (b) (6) collapse (b) (6) was transported to a local hospital via Medivac He lapsed into a coma and died on December 23, 1995

Sowa responded to questions from the Board Doris Smith asked if (b) (6) had the option of changing his test schedule Sowa responded that he did have the option and had himself set the test up on that day (12/16) Beverly Gattis asked if a timeline of events was available Sowa stated the report was not yet final and provided some assumptions on the events which occurred Smith asked if (b) (6) supervisors were notified and Sowa responded that while the trainer had no radio, the number called to reach an ambulance was (b) (6) supervisor

### **TASK FORCE REPORTS**

#### **Sitewide EIS Task Force**

C E Williams reported for the task force He said the next meeting scheduled for the task force is February 20, at 3 30 p m at the Sitewide EIS office, 6900 I-40 West in the Atrium Williams stated the group focused on the Justification for Continued Operations (JCO)



## **Environmental Restoration**

Louise Daniel reported that the task force has had very good public and board participation. Boyd Deaver, TNRCC provided a water discharge update at the January meeting. The next Environmental Restoration Task Force meeting is scheduled for February 8 at 4 30 p m. The plant tour is tentatively scheduled for March 14 at 10 a m. Bruce Campbell added that if this date is inconvenient for the Board the weeks before and after are also available. Guyon Saunders asked what the budget impact have on environmental restoration efforts at Pantex. Daniel reported that Johnnie Guelker had told the task force that he felt there would be sufficient funds for the ER program. Gerald Johnson added that Pantex is involved in actual cleanup rather than studies and cited the Pump and Treat System as an example and doesn't foresee any problems. Saunders asked if the projects are ahead of schedule. Johnson stated that all projects would be under full remediation by the year 2000, which is in line with the goals set by Clean Texas 2000. Gattis asked for a further explanation of "under full remediation". Johnson replied those activities would be started by that time, adding that Guelker could provide more detailed information.

## **UPDATES**

### **Vulnerabilities**

Gerald Johnson discussed the Justification for Continued Operations. He stated the new document contains both previous and new information. Johnson presented viewgraphs to explain the physical facility being discussed. He explained that questions had risen during the December 1995 Sitewide EIS process. TetraTech has prepared a risk assessment using different assumptions and thus the outcomes of the assessments were different from the assumptions previously accepted. The 1983 assumptions had used greater amounts of High Explosives (HE) while the 1995 suppositions were figured using lower amounts of HE. The end of the Cold War reduced the amount of HE and Pu used during assembly/disassembly activities. Johnson added that it was originally assumed that a 42 sq inch gap existed on the blast doors and it was discovered during a walkdown that the gaps were closer to 140 sq inches. Mason & Hanger has since installed a "guillotine seal" on the doors, Johnson displayed a photo of that apparatus.

Johnson discussed the probability of such a blast occurring. He stated the statistical probability is 1 in 10,000,000, adding that zero occurrences is the goal with worker/public safety being paramount. Johnson provided a graph of cell operations stating that among 5 sites with a total history of 88 years of experience there have been 0 events. He then provided risk numbers graphs and stated that while the graph shows good relative comparisons it should not be construed as any guarantee of safety. Jere White asked Johnson why the DOE waited until now to work on these problems. Johnson responded that while questions were raised regarding these rooms in 1983 EIS, the scenarios were different, one being that the amount of HE present would be sufficient to raise the gravel roof and capture the escaping plutonium. He outlined the problems and solutions which were identified and completed in the 1983 EIS. Johnson commented it was suggested by some to simply raise the amount of HE allowed into the cells, thus forcing a possible explosion upward rather than outward toward the doors. Johnson stated that while it would have solved the



immediate problem, it would raise the risk of injury to employees and therefore was not a viable solution

Johnson outlined some 1994 budget items included as changes to the cells. Seals were installed on all doors and another door with an airtight "bladder" was installed. The bladder on the new door has since been deactivated, because the bladder had to be deflated in order for the cell occupants to exit, thus creating a safety hazard. Smith asked for clarification on the bladder seals. Johnson restated that the seals are in place but have been deactivated.

Gattis asked what levels of plutonium were being used in the most recent risk assessments. Johnson stated the amount were approximately 423 kg HE and 40 kg Pu, those being "absolute worst case scenario". Joe Martillotti asked if the assumption included 100% of the Pu being aerosolized, Johnson stated that this was the assumption. Martillotti added that only 20% of that would be respirable.

Gattis asked if in the scenario the round room walls would remain intact. Johnson stated they would remain intact. Gattis also asked if this was the 25 rem at the fenceline assumption. Johnson stated that Pantex has adopted 25 rem for a lifetime as an acceptable number and cited other cities background radiation to provide relative information. He added the doors gaps are under 30 square inches now.

Guyon Saunders asked that Johnson provide an accident scenario in which the HE was dropped in handling. Johnson stated that generally a straight drop is not as great a danger as is a skid which creates friction and heat and can be a problem. He stated that minimizing handling and protecting barriers for movement are useful tools.

Jere White asked if limiting the amount of HE allowed in a cell would slow dismantlement work. Johnson stated that it would but that safety is primary goal. Bob Juba asked if a 3' to 4' drop would cause an explosion. Johnson stated it is hard to estimate, as many factors play into the scenario. Ron Zerm stated that he had seen tests with 5000 pounds of pressure applied to a small pellet of HE, no reaction occurred. Johnson stated Pantex will operate under the constraints and added that Herb Berman, Mason & Hanger is in charge of a review of the JCO and will discuss this with the SWEIS group.

Mavis Belisle asked "if an explosion occurs, does a fire always accompany the explosion?" Johnson stated that fire would be present and this is part of the risk assumption. Gattis asked if conventional (sensitive) HE is used, Johnson stated that it is used for assembly/disassembly.

Louise Daniel asked from what material the guillotine seals are made. Johnson replied that it is aluminum. William Seewald asked if the 1 in 10,000,000 risk factor is for a single operation or for operations in one year. Johnson responded that it is for a single operation.

## Occurrence Reports

Sue King, DOE reported there were 22 occurrence reports in November of which 2 were categorized as unusual and 5 Conduct of Operations. There were 26 occurrence reports in December, 2 unusual and 9 Conduct of Operations. She provided graphs comparing the number of occurrences in recent months. King highlighted reports 187 and 190, classified as unusual and



cited the testing and failure of emergency lights. She added that the unusual classification is due to these being violations of the DOE/Mason & Hanger agreement.

King cited the death of Frank Martinez and the JCO as unusual occurrences in December. Gattis stated that incomplete maintenance procedures seem to be a recurring item in the reports. King responded that while the system is designed to be "fail-safe" there are communication breakdowns, adding that check off forms are utilized. Jere White asked about another recurring topic--suspect counterfeit fasteners. King stated they are generally located by visual observation and replaced. Martillotti asked King about Report 218 and commented it was in line with Gattis' question. King restated that a status board is used to track repairs in a specific area and there are managers charged with ensuring that maintenance is complete within the allotted timeframe.

Smith asked why radioactive material would be in a non-radioactive area. King said the components are segregated and bagged and added that even though there was no opportunity for contamination to occur, this was a violation of procedure. Belisle asked why, in Report 219, the hoists in other buildings were put on hold when they were not directly effected. King stated that she was unsure but added that it could have been to check other hoists which may have had similar problems. Willie Beverly asked if the supplier of the counterfeit bolts was still being contracted. King replied possibly, that they could be, but these bolts were manufactured some time ago. Daniel asked what disciplinary action is taken in the event workers mistakenly determine work can occur although the building is in maintenance mode. King said they may either be disciplined or further training may occur to ensure they are aware of proper procedure.

Gattis asked if radioactive areas are marked and if limits are present in those areas. King stated they are supposed to be marked with an RMA (Radioactive Material Area) sign and different areas have different limits. Louise Daniel asked if the occurrence report numbers could be put in bold to make each report more readable.

## DISCUSSION OF ADVICE

Louise Daniel stated that the response to the PPCAB's advice to DOE on HE Fabrication activities was provided to all Board members (Attachment A). She said decisions regarding this activity are still in process. Kerry Campbell-Keith, Mason & Hanger provided dates for the upcoming EIS hearings: March 21 is Stockpile/Stewardship and Management, March 28 is Fissile Materials Disposition and the Sitewide EIS hearing is planned for April 4. Tom Williams urged the Board to send a letter to DOE recommending the three meetings be consolidated into one. He said the public is likely to become confused among the three issues, thus diluting interest. He added that people see one Pantex. Gattis suggested that two meetings, one for the Pantex-specific issue and the other for the Programmatic EISs might be helpful. Daniel asked if the Board could actually influence this decision. Williams stated that he certainly hopes so, as the Board should have an impact. Johnson also urged the Board to take a position on this matter. Saunders agreed that the fragmentation will make the issues more unlikely to provoke public interest and input and urged the Board to draft a letter. Martillotti gave his view of the problem. He said that spreading the issues out a bit more might make them more understandable. Johnson said the only problem with this option is whether the public would have adequate time to prepare comments prior to the Record of Decision. Dave Heim suggested the Board should decide now.



whether or not to send a letter Bob Juba agreed the consolidation would be good for public input Louise Daniel and Tom Williams will meet to draft a letter on behalf of the Board

## **EMPLOYEE CONCERNS AND RESPONSE PROCESS PRESENTATION**

Van Petten introduced the guidelines for all speakers The presenters are asked to discuss only process issues and refrain from discussing Pantex issues related to any specific case(s)

### **Government Accountability Project**

Tom Carpenter is director of the Seattle office and staff attorney for the Government Accountability Project (GAP) Carpenter stated GAP is a 501(c)3 non-profit organization and gave a brief historical background and overview of its mission He said GAP's first priority is defending whistleblowers and helping to develop open cultures at government sites is also part of that mission Carpenter said GAP handled its first whistleblower case in 1985 at Fernald He discussed a Whistleblower Four Part Initiative which resulted in the formation of the Hanford Joint Council The Joint Council was an unprecedented experiment that stipulates Westinghouse will "presumptively implement" all of the recommendations made by the council unless problems arise with legal/contractual agreements etc Carpenter reported GAP has been active at Pantex since March 1995 and is working here because an employee had experienced problems and asked GAP to handle the case He added that there has been more than one such incident

Carpenter gave a few examples of "cultural issues" which GAP believes are primary at Pantex focus on production goals, reprisals, Conduct of Operations, safety concerns, co-worker hostility, etc He said GAP offers several recommendations for Pantex, including the Joint Council Program, training in whistleblower rights, etc He added that these programs have been successful at other sites, create positive dialogue and foster understanding

### **Mason & Hanger-Silas Mason Co. Inc.**

Robin McLaurin, Employee Concerns Program Manager, presented her background in human resources and discussed the implementation and growth of the Employee Concerns Program at Mason & Hanger She said that during FY 96 her office has received 64 calls regarding employee concerns She described the programs available at Pantex She stated that most contacts are made through personal office visits Her office logs all employee concerns by type and follows all complaints to resolution She added that training is the key to an effective Employee Concerns Program

### **Metal Trades Council**

Ron Zerm, Metal Trades Safety Officer, gave an overview of his 16-year job experience at Pantex His position as a liaison between management and the Metal Trades Council He stated there are three full-time safety officers, all of whom are bargaining unit employees He added that the program is designed to be non-threatening The officers investigate calls and deal with the



facts, pursuing the problem to a resolution Zerm described several programs in place at Pantex, including the Voluntary Protection Program, Hazardous Inspection Team, etc

### Question/Answer Session

In response to Tom Carpenter's comments, Gerald Johnson, DOE, made three observations

- 1) The idea that Pantex places production goals over safety is commonly used against DOE DOE is under a mandate to keep the two in balance, the goal is to disassemble as safely as possible HE added the \$11,000,000 award fee available to Mason & Hanger is based 55% on environment, safety and health , and 15% on production Johnson cited the 1994 voluntary maintenance mode as an example He said Mason & Hanger received the Notable Achievement Award from DOE, which is the highest award given by the agency Johnson stated the production goal is 2000 units per year, yet actual performance has been at least 25% below that goal for the last three years
- 2) Johnson stated that Pantex works to balance worker rights with public safety He commented that all employees must undergo a rigorous physical and mental exam schedule He added the background investigation reviews a person's entire life history, all safeguards are geared toward ensuring public safety and security
- 3) Johnson remarked that employee involvement is an old paradigm He noted three Pantex initiatives the Voluntary Protection Program which was copied from OSHA and developed by the workers, the Seamless Safety Program, developed by workers and engineers, and the Employee Concerns Program, which has the highest number of reported occurrences in the entire complex Johnson believes the high number of reports reveals that employees are comfortable bringing their concerns to plant management Willie Beverly asked what number of harassment reports are sexual harassment Robin McLaurin stated that while those number can be broken down, she did not know the exact numbers Beverly asked how that area "problems noted" was handled McLaurin stated that her office recommends a resolution to each problem Beverly added that a supervisor can make a job difficult for an employee and perhaps DOE and Mason & Hanger upper management are not aware of all the problems He urged the DOE and Mason & Hanger not to abandon their efforts in trying to contact workers who might experience problems in the workplace

Carpenter commented Hanford exhibited the same attitudes as those exhibited by Pantex management, adding that while litigation is not the answer, it is the only tool for whistleblowers as there is no worker protection within the DOE

Johnson rebutted, saying that it is not the goal to convey that Pantex is perfect, but that management is trying to make changes and address problems for the 3300 employees at the site Carpenter agreed that the positive changes are good Zerm commented the Metal Trades Council can protect the employee and no employee is "beat up", thus far the Council system has worked

Daniel commented that Employee Concerns are being addressed by various means She also asked if McLaurin is the initial point of contact for concerned employees McLaurin responded



004801

that the Employee Concerns office is a "clearinghouse" for complaints which are logged and routed to the appropriate area for resolution. She added they are currently working on a method to ensure anonymity and protect the employee from possible retaliation, citing examples of methods that have been/will be tried.

Patrick Padilla asked Carpenter the number of employees who have come forward to claim or substantiate other's claims and what types of retaliation have been experienced. Carpenter stated the number of clients had not been determined and the types of retaliation included being idled/moved off a project, ostracized by fellow employees, being yelled at by supervisors, etc. Carpenter commented that GAP receives its information through studying occurrence reports and DNFSB trip reports.

Doris Smith asked Zerm how contacts are made and McLaurin if the complaint form must be completed to file with her office. Zerm responded that they are generally made through phone calls or during the regular safety officer walk-around. McLaurin stated her group provides a form that can be completed but is not a requirement. She was also asked if the training programs were voluntary. McLaurin stated they are mandatory plant-wide and will be fully implemented during May to July of 1996.

Saunders asked McLaurin to define the difference between a whistle blower and a concerned employee. McLaurin said she believes a whistleblower is an employee who is seeking assistance as a result of retaliation brought on by a concern having been raised, a concerned employee has not been retaliated against and followed the concern through to resolution. McLaurin stated there have been 4 requests for anonymity during FY96.

Saunders urged Carpenter to reveal those safety concerns at Pantex of which he is aware. Carpenter responded those concerns are protected by client confidentiality. Pam Allison asked Carpenter if he knows what percentage of incidents have been reported or not reported. Carpenter stated that they were given an impression through affidavits, interviews, etc. and followed through, adding their main mission is to get rid of GAP because it is no longer needed. Carpenter stated other sites are embracing these programs thus GAP is having a positive presence. Allison asked Zerm how many members belong to the MTC has at Pantex. He said the number varies between 800 to 900 members.

Mavis Belisle asked McLaurin to define the term "management issues". McLaurin cited the example of problems with a performance appraisal, adding there are more reported incidents in some departments/divisions than others, but this may be due to greater employee numbers in those areas. Daniel asked Carpenter how many complaints GAP has noted pre-date March 1995 (implementation of the Employee Concerns Program). He responded that most do pre-date March 1995 and most are bargaining unit employees. Denise Price asked Carpenter if monetary compensation is received through these cases. He responded that compensation is sometimes sought, adding that it is generally back wage compensation (\$10,000 to \$80,000, occasionally six-figure). Carpenter said GAP is not a law firm but rather a non-profit 501(c)3 and never receives a percent of the award. He commented that GAP receives and studies DNFSB trip reports.

Gattis asked Zerm how the union handles the complaint situation. He responded they deal strictly with the facts and a steward would become involved. If a union member violated



procedures/standards, appropriate action would be taken. Gattis asked Carpenter if Pantex's culture would change if the suggested changes were implemented. He responded that Pantex would be "on a good path", adding there must be the recognition that GAP can offer options for positive change, again citing the Hanford Joint Council model.

McLaurin stated that the Mason & Hanger program formally covers Mason & Hanger and Battelle employees, adding that any subcontractor complaints would be addressed as well.

John Blakley asked Carpenter to clarify the number of complainants at Pantex. Carpenter responded that it is "moving target" but is approximately 36-38 persons. Blakley urged that the entire program not be changed for approximately 1% of the employee population. He added that Carpenter has portrayed the Hanford Joint Council as a "fix-all". Carpenter stated it is not a "fix-all" but rather a useful tool and one that Westinghouse fully supports.

Martillotti stated that retaliation is against the law and asked if this is made clear during training. Zerm stated that three supervisors have been terminated as a result of action taken to resolve this problem. McLaurin stated that Mason & Hanger has a policy of zero tolerance in place.

Tom Williams commented on his own personal background. He challenged Carpenter that if he indeed has information on safety concerns, then it is his moral obligation to report those problems immediately to ensure that no worker or the public is exposed to any undue risk. He added that the failure to do so could be considered negligent. Carpenter responded that while he understands Williams' concern, he will discuss the issue with his client and urge the disclosure of the problems to proper individuals.

Daniel stated that questions and responses concentrate on factual material rather than debate.

Bob Seldon, GAP attorney, offered to sit in for Tom Carpenter as he was leaving very soon. Padilla stated his personal experience with the safety programs at Pantex, he commented that a great deal of employee time is spent supporting those efforts.

Bob Juba asked Seldon that if the goal of GAP is to reach a resolution then why is the media used. Seldon explained that when both sides are not invested equally in problem resolution, GAP utilizes tools such as media pressure and close contacts to the Secretary of Energy.

Kerry Campbell-Keith asked how many of the 36-38 people who have stepped forward to give interviews, etc. to GAP have been used to validate/witness another's claim and how many have been directly affected. Seldon stated this is not easy to determine but believes most are to substantiate claims but 3 or 4 discussed personal retaliation and at least 20 feared retaliation. He stated that Bill Weinreich, Mason & Hanger Plant Manager, has pledged to take action on the concerns raised. Campbell asked Seldon how problems are resolved without litigation. Bob Juba asked Seldon if the problems raised by his client represent any danger to the public.

Gattis reminded those present of the guidelines and that no specific incidents can be discussed.

William Seewald stated he believes the media is fulfilling its mission by covering all aspects of the issue.



Vanessa Tatum asked Seldon where GAP receives funding. He responded that GAP is not-for-profit and receives funding from a variety of sources, including direct mail efforts, and some attorney fee awards, adding the federal government pays attorney fees. Price asked for clarification on this point as she had asked earlier if the attorney received compensation. Seldon explained that awards to the client and attorney fees are separate issues.

Van Petten gave information about non-profits to the group stating that 501(c)3 organizations must file form 990 which discloses financial information and is public information upon request.

## **SUBCOMMITTEE REPORTS**

### **Nominations**

Jere White reported for the subcommittee. He stated that Walton Poling, candidate for the agriculture stakeholder category, is unable to accept the position. Saunders asked if Smith would retain her agriculture position, White stated that she would. White submitted three names to the Board and recommended they accept Randy Braidfoot as the business stakeholder representative, adding the appointment process for Braidfoot could be finalized in February. Belisle cautioned the subcommittee to keep in mind the gender-balance needed on the Board.

## **CLOSING COMMENTS**

Marilyn Van Petten stated that other PPCAB subcommittees had submitted written reports and would report further if necessary at the February meeting. She thanked all the participants and reminded them of the February Board meeting and Orientation session planned.

Meeting adjourned at 5:55 p.m.